

Remarks

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-12, 14 and 17-19 are pending.

All pending claims stand rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Webb (5,727,135).

Applicants seek to amend Claim 1 to clarify that the display includes a single second selectable icon that when selected actuates the duplicators represented by a selection of more than one of the first selectable icons. Similar amendments are proposed for Claims 10 and 14.

Webb Fig. 8 teaches the simultaneous display of a plurality of first selectable icons each representing a different printer. There is nothing in Webb Fig. 8 or the accompanying text at column 19, however, that teaches a second selectable icon that actuates even a single printer selected from the group of first icons. The Office's assertion to the contrary is not correct. None of the icons in Fig. 8 of Webb actuate any of the printers represented by icons 303, 304 and 305. If the Office disagrees, it is respectfully requested to specifically point out and explain the figures and/or text in Webb that teach the required second selectable icon. For this reason, Claims 1, 14 and 19 in their current form are allowable over Webb along with the claims that depend from Claims 1 and 14.

Nevertheless, Applicants propose to amend Claims 1, 10 and 14 to further distinguish Webb. Claim 1, as amended, recites a single second selectable icon that when selected actuates the duplicators represented by the selection of more than one of the first icons. The amendment to Claim 1 makes it clear that a single icon that can actuate plural duplicators is part of the display. There is nothing in Webb that even remotely resembles the user interface of amended Claim 1. Method Claim 14 contains similar limitations.

Applicants propose to amend Claim 10 to recite that plural selections from a user interface display of multiple duplicator selections simultaneously initiates duplication tasks on each of the selected duplicators. As with amended Claim 1, there is nothing in Webb that teaches or suggests such a user interface.

Although the Office no longer relies on Machida (6,642,943) and the question of the sufficiency of the Rule 131 Declaration previously submitted is moot, Applicants wish to note that the Office incorrectly rejected the Rule 131 Declaration. First, where, as here, a joint inventor is not available to sign the Declaration, the signature of the remaining joint inventor is sufficient. MPEP 715.04. The absence of inventor Aguilera's signature, therefore, has no bearing on the sufficiency of the Declaration. Second, Fig. 1 of the Invention Disclosure document attached to the Declaration is nearly identical to Fig. 3 in the patent Application and clearly shows the features recited in Claims 1, 2, 8-12, 14 and 19.

The Application is felt to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeff Aguilera et al.

By 

Steven R. Ormiston
Reg. No. 35,974
208.433.1991 x204

January 14, 2005